BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT
CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: NHDOT Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting
DATE OF CONFERENCE: May 20, 2015
LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building
ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT
Matt Urban
Ron Crickard
Mark Hemmerlien
Jason Savage
David Scott
Tobey Reynolds
Joshua Lafond
Kathleen Corliss
Jon Hebert
Mike Dugas
Rebecca Martin
Jason Tremblay
Colleen White
Jim Kirouac
Michael Licciardi
Steve Glines
Ron Kleiner

Federal Highway Administration
Jamie Sikora

Army Corps of Engineers
Michael Hicks
Richard Kristoff

NHDES
Gino Infascelli
Lori Sommer

NH Fish & Game
Carol Henderson

NH Natural Heritage Bureau
Amy Lamb

Strafford RPC
Colin Lentz

PIM-INC
Todd Kilburn
Jerry Kruegler

CHA
William Horne
Robert Faulkner

PRESENTATIONS/ PROJECTS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:
(minutes on subsequent pages)

(When viewing these minutes online, click on a project to zoom to the minutes for that project)

NOTES ON CONFERENCE:

Finalization of April 15th 2015 Meeting Minutes

Matt Urban indicated that the he had not received any comments for the April 15th meeting, he indicated he would finalize the minutes a couple of days after this meeting provided there are no additional comments and/or objections at this time. Subsequent to the meeting no additional comments were received and the minutes were finalized.

Central Turnpike Drainage Rehabilitation Project, 29024, Non-Federal

Sam Newsom presented the project details. The project proposes repairs to outlet/inlet pipes, culvert headwalls and placement of stone fill for scour protection at 12 culverts of varying types, sizes and lengths on the F.E. Everett Turnpike, I-293 and I-93 in Nashua, Bedford, Hooksett, Bow and Concord. There will also be 5 slope pipe replacements and miscellaneous incidental work. S. Newsom showed aerial maps of each of the locations with the wetlands delineated on the maps and discussed each proposed activity at each of the mile markers where work is proposed to be conducted. He explained that this project includes all of the pipes that did not conform to the Routine Roadway Maintenance Permitting guidelines and will require a Dredge and Fill Wetlands Permit. S. Newsom explained that drainage infrastructure was built between the 1950's and 1990's and has experienced deterioration over its lifetime. The drainage is in need of maintenance and repairs to ensure that the pipes remain functional and prevent erosion of the roadway embankments and watercourses. The proposed stone lining at the drainage outlets and along waterways will stabilize the channels and prevent transport of sediments downstream. S. Newsom described and showed photographs of some of the damage at various project locations, including slope pipe corrosion, deteriorated and disjointed pipe sections, significant cracking/break up of stone sections of headwalls, and headwall that are undermined or have separated from the adjoining pipe. S. Newsom detailed the proposed repairs, including:

- MM 6 – Slip Line twin RCP pipes and add stone protection
- MM 7.8 twin CMP (2 locations) require slip line or cutting out bottoms of the pipes and pouring concrete. Slip lining of the remaining 2 pipes
- MM 19.3 Inlet stone protection behind headwall and outlet headwall repair/replacement with stone protection.
- MM 4.6 Inlet and outlet repair with stone protection
- MM 30.2 Both pipes need inlet headwall repair/replacement and stone protection
- MM 30.8 Outlet needs the last 2 section of pipes reset, headwall replacement and stone protection
- MM 36.3 Inlet needs 1 section of new pipe, headwall and slope stabilization

The proposed repairs will extend the life the existing infrastructure and avoid more costly repairs in the future. S. Newsom explained that there will be less than 1 acre of impacts and there will be minimal tree clearing for access to the project areas. The established channels will be maintained. The group discussed beaver activity at the pipe in Concord (MM 36.3). Carol Henderson

recommended considering a beaver pipe (box within a pipe) and suggested contacting Rob Calvert for more information. C. Henderson asked if the hydrology will be changing when pipes are slip-lined and David Smith explained that due to the smoother plastic lining, the capacity of the pipes will not be reduced.

Rebecca Martin explained that the NHB review did result in several rare species that have been identified in or near proposed project areas. Kim Tuttle has been contacted and has requested that John Magee consider fish passage. The size of the watershed of the drainage systems have been calculated and shared with John Magee and Kim Tuttle.

S. Newsom described the timeline for the project, including sending the Wetland Permit to the Bureau of Environment by the end of May, advertising October 6, 2015, and project completion on September 30, 2016.

Matt Urban asked if mitigation will be necessary for the project and Gino Infascelli commented that project plans will be needed to ascertain what the impacts will be. Details and USGS maps of each specific area will be needed. G. Infascelli explained that culverts with Tier 2 streams can be slip-lined, but Tier 3 cannot. Lori Sommer stated that mitigation can be assessed when the project impacts are shown on plans. G. Infascelli made the general comment that it seems that rip rap is excessive at some project locations and to only use what is warranted by field conditions.
S. Newsom shared pictures with C. Henderson at the end of the presentation.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Bethlehem, 26763, X-A004(296)

Joshua Lafond provided an overview of the project. The project includes replacement of the culvert that passes under Main Street (Route 302) in Bethlehem east of Route 142 to resolve ongoing issues with maintenance of the existing culvert and to meet the capacity of the water flowing through the culvert. District has experienced difficulties maintaining the existing culvert due to age and instability. A sink hole developed over the culvert in the summer of 2013 due to decay of the structure and one of the drop inlets into the culvert collapsed in 2014 and needed to be replaced. The stream passing through the culvert is an unnamed tributary to Barret Brook. The culvert inlet is adjacent the Bethlehem visitor center and historical society building. The outlet is behind the post office and the Maia Papaya restaurant.

The existing culvert is 170 feet long and is a combination of 3 different construction methods. The original stone masonry culvert is the middle section of the culvert, passing under Route 302 (Main Street). The age of this section is unknown, but a plan from 1920 shows this section as existing. At some point, inlet and outlet extensions were added onto the culvert. The inlet of the culvert is a concrete box and the outlet is a steel arch pipe. No plans have been located for the associated extensions. J. Lafond explained that the inlet of the pipe has two retaining walls which are in poor condition and that one of the retaining walls has begun to fall into the stream. In addition, J. Lafond showed a photograph that demonstrated that the outlet of the culvert is perched and the steel has corroded significantly. In the pipe there are issues with separation of sections of the pipe.

J. Lafond described the proposed project to replace the existing culvert and remove the retaining walls at the inlet and extend the culvert at the outlet. Impacts to the stream and banks are anticipated. At the inlet the estimated area of impact would be around 445 square feet to remove the walls and create a natural slope to the stream on each side. J. Lafond described that the outlet would be extended approximately 20 feet due to the steep slope and that the approximate impacted area would be 970 square feet.

J. Lafond presented the alternatives that were considered. The first and least expensive option would be to rehabilitate the existing culvert. However, rehabilitation would not address the outlet perch and Jim Kirouac stated that the current pipe does not meet the capacity of the water flow. The second alternative was the recommendation of the stream crossing assessment conducted by the Bureau of Environment, a 21 foot 3 sided structure. This alternative has constructability issues due to potential impacts to surrounding potentially historic buildings and Right of Way. The third alternative is a 8 foot wide by 8 foot tall box with 2 feet of embedment that would meet culvert design requirements and capacity for a 50 year storm. The preferred alternative is a 12 foot wide by 8 foot tall box with 2 feet of embedment, which would be designed to meet capacity for a 100 year storm and bridge design requirements, as structures with spans greater than 10' are classified as bridges and sized accordingly. This is the preferred alternative because it provides greater resiliency. J. Lafond showed a depiction of the 21 foot span and impacts to adjacent structures to illustrate the constructability issues.

J. Lafond and J. Kirouac provided a description of the trunk lines that currently feed stormwater from the roadway into the culvert. A sink hole developed this spring over the trunk line just west of the culvert and is in need of repair. The intent with this project is to only address the trunk line issues immediately adjacent to the culvert, as the entire road and drainage are in need of rehabilitation at a future date. J. Kirouac explained that the trunk lines are metal or concrete where they attach to the culvert, but are clay further east and west of the project area. J. Lafond also mentioned that the drop inlet that feeds directly into the culvert will be redesigned to not drop directly into the culvert.

Carol Henderson asked for more information about the construction of the replacement box culvert. J. Kirouac described that the box would likely be pre-cast concrete sections with rubber gaskets.

Lori Sommer and Matt Urban explained that there will be mitigation required for impacts to the stream from extension of the outlet of the culvert. J. Kirouac explained that the intent behind the extension is to attempt to achieve 2:1 slopes, which would be more stable than the existing 1:1 slopes. Gino Infascelli warned that the parking lots of the adjacent businesses may extend when the culvert extends. He recommended controlling project creep as part of the Right of Way process. The group seemed supportive of the preferred alternative.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Stewartstown, 16312, X-0001(240)

Rebecca Martin provided a brief overview of the project and showed photographs of the bridge over Bishop Brook. Michael Licciardi explained that the bridge on Route 145 over Bishop Brook is the 6th priority bridge on the State's Red List. The two lane bridge (121/114) is proposed for replacement due to the fact that the bridge deck is in poor condition and the substructure is in serious condition. The new bridge span is proposed to be 50 feet with Northeast Extreme Tee (NEXT) beams for the superstructure. The length is based on the stream crossing assessment conducted by the Bureau of Environment and the orientation of the stream channel to the roadway (skewed). M. Licciardi stated that the bridge will be 27 feet wide.

M. Licciardi described that the vertical and horizontal alignment of the new bridge will be approximately the same as the existing. There will be 360 feet of road reconstruction (220 feet to the south of the bridge and 140 feet to the north). The wetland impacts have been estimated to be 3,800 square feet of permanent impacts and 3,200 feet of temporary impacts. Mark Hemmerlein stated that the brook is an Outstanding Resource Water.

R. Martin explained that the NHB review resulted in a result for historic records of two rare plants. The area will be surveyed when the plants are flowering, in August. Amy Lamb recommended flagging the area, if any of the plants are found.

Mike Hicks inquired about the historic status of the bridge. R. Martin explained that the bridge was surveyed and has been determined not to be eligible for the National Register. The adjacent Farm property is eligible and slope easements will be discussed with the property owners.

Lori Sommer asked for a description of the armoring. M. Licciardi showed the areas on the plans where armoring will be installed. The stone is intended to extend from the abutments on both sides. L. Sommer said that mitigation will not be required given that the structure is designed to meet the stream crossing rules.

The project is expected to advertise in January 2016 with construction in spring and summer of 2016. Jason Tremblay stated that the wetland permit is expected to be submitted this summer.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Dixville, 29776, Non-Federal

Jon Hebert provided a description of the project and purpose for the action. J. Hebert explained that the pedestrian culvert passing under NH Route 26 is an 84 inch CMP pedestrian passage that was constructed in 1978. The passage provides access to the recreational trail system and is utilized by snowmobiles. The current passage is not large enough to accommodate all users. The proposed replacement is a 3 sided structure around 20 feet wide that will accommodate passage of trail groomers, horses, and other users.

To replace the pedestrian culvert a temporary detour of NH Route 26 to include the area south of the roadway will be necessary. Two-way traffic is intended to be maintained through the project

area. Once the detour is built, traffic will be detoured to the south and the northern portion of the structure will be constructed. In the second phase of the project, the traffic will be routed to the north and the southern half of the structure will be constructed. J. Hebert commented that the roadway embankments in the area are quite high, almost 25 feet.

J. Hebert told the group that rehabilitating the existing culvert is not a viable option due to the fact that the current culvert is not large enough to meet the needs of the users of the passage.
J. Hebert explained that there are 3 culvert crossings for drainage existing in the project area. One of the culverts will need to be extended to accommodate construction of the new passage. The drainage is sheet flow off the roadway and will not be changed in any significant way by the project.

J. Hebert explained that in order to access the northern portion of the project, a temporary access/haul road may be constructed from west of the project area. There is a significant amount of material that will need to be removed to accommodate construction and the road bank in this area is very steep. The majority of the work will be within the existing Right of Way. J. Hebert commented that the Balsalms Resort is amenable to use of their property, if necessary, as they are in favor of the project.

The project will impact wetlands. Approximately 7,600 square feet of total impacts are anticipated. Matt Urban explained that most of the wetlands in the area are emergent ditch line wetlands. On the north side of the road way wetlands are scrub-shrub wetlands. Rebecca Martin showed photographs of the area. Jon Hebert commented that the advertising date is in September, the wetland application is anticipated to be submitted within the next month, and construction is planned for summer 2016. ***Following the meeting the advertising date was moved ahead to sometime in August.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Carroll-Jefferson, 25066, X-A003(023)

Steve Glines introduced the Carrol-Jefferson project located on NH Route 115. S. Glines explained that the project has already been out to construction for some time already and that the job had to be suspended when they realized there were numerous pipes that needed to be addressed. S. Glines explained that one day while the paving equipment was going over an existing culvert the MTV (Material Transfer Vehicle) punched through the pavement due to excessive deterioration of a corrugated metal pipe. The culvert was not able to support the weight and collapsed.

Following the incident the Department inspected all of the pipes in the surrounding areas and identified 11 pipes that were in need of repairs. The Department immediately obtained a Routine Roadway Maintenance Activity Notification (RRMAN) for all of the pipes. However, S. Glines explained that there were many design constraints that the Department was up against, the most challenging being the depth of excavation required to replace these pipes. For that reason the Department has held off on replacing the pipes under the RRMAN and is pursuing the option to slip line 6 of the deepest pipes which would require a standard Dredge and Fill Application.

The proposed method of slip lining that is being considered is a UV lining. Todd Kilburn and Jerry Kruegler from PIM-Inc. briefly discussed the installation process and environmental benefits of using the UV lining method.

Matt Urban indicated that he believes all of the crossings would qualify as either Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 and that they should be able to be sliplined under the existing stream crossing rules. M.Urban asked if there were any concerns from the resource agencies moving forward with the slip lining option.

There were no concerns raised by the agencies.

M. Urban indicated to Lori and Gino that as refined delineations and impacts areas are determined for each pipe location we will be in communication regarding the need for mitigation or not.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Conway, 25103, X-A003(039)

Rob Faulkner briefly introduced the project describing the work as a countermeasure installation at the Conway Covered bridge (East Side road over the Saco River). CHA provided handouts including 1 preliminary plan sheet, site photographs and information on Partially Grouted Riprap (PGR). R. Faulkner indicated to the Agencies that this historic covered bridge received approval for bridge preservation funds to install PGR for scour protection around the bridge supports as part of a National Historic Covered Bridge Preservation application submitted by NHDOT.

R. Faulkner provided an overview of the project intended to protect this bridge from damage during a flood. This 2 span historic covered bridge is currently coded as scour critical and considered vulnerable to erosion/scour during severe flood events. The FHWA mandated Plan of Action (POA) proposed by NHDOT is to install an armoring layer (countermeasures) of material designed to resist erosion around the abutments and pier. Directly upstream of this bridge the Swift River flows into the Saco River.

Temporary access to all three substructure units is proposed from both sides of the river.
On the downstream west side, temporary access is proposed from a private land owner extending upstream along the bank to the west abutment. A temporary causeway is also proposed starting from this area extending out in the river to the upstream end of the pier to allow equipment and materials to the pier. The specific height of this temporary causeway is proposed to be roughly 2 feet above the average flow for the months of August, September, and October. This hydraulic design information (causeway elevation and opening) will be developed as the design efforts advance. The causeway will be removed after construction. No disturbance is planned for the privately owned upstream west bank.
On the east side of the river, access to the east abutment and upstream bank area will either be from the downstream bank area (via Town of Conway Local Park) or from the upstream private land owner.

NHDOT will contact the Town of Conway and inquire about a potential access location from the Town Park. In addition, CHA and NHDOT are investigating whether or not the local park is a Section 6(f) of 4(f) resource and the existing ROW information for the project is still pending. A Phase 1A Archeologic investigation performed by CHA's sub-consultant IAC, indicated that the areas around this bridge have the potential to contain Archeological resources. A Phase 1B investigation will be performed at all three potential access areas at this site.

Two types of countermeasures are proposed at this site. The first, NHDOT Class A & B Stone Fill is individual angular stone approximately 2-3' average diameter which is proposed at selected bank areas on both sides of the river (see Plan sheet). The second is Partially Grouted Riprap (PGR), which is proposed to be installed in front of both abutments and around the pier. While PGR has not been used widely throughout the United States, it has been used extensively in Europe with great success. CHA discussed the advantages with PGR including minimizing the impact to the placement area by using less/smaller diameter material (riprap) which requires less channel excavation/preparation and partially grouting the voids between the stones with a special high slump concrete mix. The result is a larger but thinner interlocking stable layer of stones designed to resist flood velocities much higher than with un-grouted stone.

PGR was installed by NHDOT bridge maintenance forces in 2011 at a single span bridge in Holderness, NH. The result is a natural boulder laden channel bed that has gravel and sand deposits similar to a native stream bed. For the past 4 years the site is considered stable and the PGR countermeasure is performing well.

During the grouting process for the PGR countermeasure, a cofferdam and turbidity curtain barrier are proposed to isolate and contain the work area around the abutments from the river. Excavation, channel bed preparation, stone placement and grouting are all planned to be completed in a non-dewatered environment. During grouting the contractor will be required to monitor for any pH increases noted outside the contained work area. If pH measurements exceed allowable thresholds then the grouting operations will be suspended or modified until pH levels fall within an acceptable range.

At the pier there is a considerable amount of existing rounded 1-3' diameter stones visible in the site photos. CHA proposes to use much of the existing material and add supplemental stone to create a uniform layer of stone extending roughly 16 ft. out from the pier face around the perimeter of the pier. Water diversion methods (temporary causeway) will reduce the flow velocities and turbidity curtains will isolate the work area from the river. Excavation, channel bed preparation, stone placement and grouting are all planned to be completed in a non-dewatered environment. During grouting the contractor will be required to monitor for any pH increases noted outside the contained work area. If pH measurements exceed allowable thresholds then the grouting operations will be suspended or modified until pH levels fall within an acceptable range.
NHB initial screening indicated no occurrences for sensitive species (The NHB file number is 15 – 1681). It was noted during the meeting that the area was likely habitat for long eared bats. CHA will be contacting Susie van Oettingen from the USFWS to review this project related to potential impacts to the Long Eared Bat

Lori Sommer and Gino Infascelli (NHDES) provided an initial designation of "No Mitigation" and this project will be classified as "protection of existing infrastructure". G. Infascelli also indicated the Swift and Saco Rivers are considered a Designated river.

CHA will review the need for a NOI as the design development progresses. It was felt that the overall impact area would be less than 1 acre, however the project may include some dewatering / discharge. Pending results from the environmental screening as well as outstanding ROW information, CHA will be completing the NEPA documentation for the project.

It was noted that the project is expected to be advertised in January 2016 and that the construction duration is expected to be 4-6 weeks and intended to be completed during the seasonal low flow period between August and October.

Carol Henderson (NHFG) asked if A - Jacks were considered? CHA respond yes they were considered and dismissed based on additional bed preparation/disturbance efforts and the fact that the precast concrete A-Jacks would be visible above the normal water elevation and look less like a natural stream.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Cornish, 29024, Non-Federal

Rob Faulkner introduced this project as a countermeasure installation at the Cornish Toll Road Covered bridge (Bridge street) over the Connecticut River. CHA provided handouts including 1 preliminary plan sheet, site photographs and information on Partially Grouted Riprap (PGR). This historic covered bridge received approval for bridge preservation funds to install PGR for scour protection around the bridge supports as part of a National Historic Covered Bridge Preservation application submitted by NHDOT.

Rob Faulkner provided an overview of the project intended to protect this bridge from damage during a flood. This 2 span historic covered bridge is currently coded scour critical and considered vulnerable to erosion/scour during severe flood events. The FHWA mandated Plan of Action (POA) proposed by NHDOT is to install an armoring layer (countermeasures) of material designed to resist erosion around the abutments and pier. Temporary access to all three substructure units is proposed from using a state-owned parking area on the downstream southeast quadrant to construct a temporary riverbank bulkhead to accommodate marine barges and boats. Marine access is planned for the western abutment (Vermont side) as well as the pier. NHDOT will contact the Vermont Agency of Transportation and provide information of the proposed project. Separate permits (NH & VT) are anticipated. Coordination with the US Coast Guard is also planned for this project.

Two types of countermeasures are proposed at this site. The first, NHDOT Class A & B Stone Fill is individual angular stone approximately 2-3' average diameter which is proposed at the pier and at selected bank areas on both sides of the river. At the pier the majority of the existing timber crib system is visible/exposed up to 1'upstream of the pier and along the western (Vermont) side of the pier. The timber crib along the east (NH) side of the pier is exposed up to 6' vertically and the

channel bed is significantly deeper in this area. Un-grouted stone is proposed to re-establish the existing riverbed and cover the timber cribbing system around the pier. Minimal excavation of sand deposits at the downstream end of the pier will be removed prior to placement of the Class A & B stone fill. Turbidity curtains will be installed and contain the work area prior to any excavation (bed preparation) of the downstream pier nose as shown on the plan sheet.

Partially Grouted Riprap (PGR) is proposed to be installed in front of both abutments. While PGR has not been used widely throughout the United States, it has been used extensively in Europe with great success. CHA discussed the advantages with PGR including minimizing the impact to the placement area by using less/smaller diameter material (riprap) which requires less channel excavation/preparation and partially grouting the voids between the stones with a special high slump concrete mix. The result is a larger but thinner interlocking stable layer of stones designed to resist flood velocities much higher than with un-grouted stone. PGR was installed by NHDOT bridge maintenance forces in 2011 at a single span bridge in Holderness, NH. The result is a natural boulder laden channel bed that has gravel and sand deposits similar to a native stream bed. For the past 4 years the site is considered stable and the PGR countermeasure is performing well.

During the grouting process for the PGR countermeasure, a cofferdam and turbidity curtain barrier are proposed to isolate and contain the work area around the abutments from the river. Excavation, channel bed preparation, stone placement and grouting are all planned to be completed in a non-dewatered environment. During grouting the contractor will be required to monitor for any pH increases noted outside the contained work area. If pH measurements exceed allowable thresholds then the grouting operations will be suspended or modified until pH levels fall within an acceptable range.

NHB initial screening indicated the presence of sensitive species; however, the specifics were not provided pending payment for the complete database search. It was noted during the meeting that the area was likely habitat for long eared bats and Mussels. The NHB file number has been requested. CHA will be contacting Susie van Ottingen from the USFWS to review this project related to potential impacts to the Long Eared Bat

Lori Sommer and Gino Infascelli provided an initial designation of “no Mitigation” and this project will be classified as “protection of existing infrastructure” G. Infascelli also indicated the Connecticut River is considered a designated river.

CHA will review the need for a NOI as the design development progresses. It was felt that the overall impact area would be less than 1 acre, however the project may include some dewatering / discharge. Pending results from the environmental screening as well as outstanding ROW information, CHA will be completing the NEPA documentation for the project.

It was noted that the project is expected to be advertised in January 2016 and that the construction duration is expected to be 4-6 weeks and intended to be completed during the seasonal low flow period between July and October.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Farmington, 16146, X-A001(152)

Ron Kleiner provided a brief project recap. The NHDOT will be replacing the bridge carrying NH Route 153 over the Cocheco River (Br No 096/140), just south of downtown Farmington. The 1924 structure is two spans, and 48 ft. in length. It will be replaced by a single span bridge, 71 ft. long. The bridge is adjacent to a USACE flood control levee.

It was recently brought to the DOT's attention that the Town of Farmington is required to maintain the levee. Currently, there are some gravel shoals not far upstream of the bridge. As part of the maintenance operations, it was suggested by the USACE that those shoals be dredged out of the river by the Town.

The DOT was asked by the Town if that work could be somehow include in the bridge work, or at the very least included in the permits for the project. The DOT was looking for input on the ramifications of adding that work to the existing efforts, from a permitting aspect.

During the discussion, the merit of the dredging was questioned. Several people wondered if removing the shoals would actually fix the problem, or if they would just come right back. There was also some opinion that simply widening the bridge, as proposed, would allow the shoals to wash away naturally.

If the dredging moves forward, it was noted that the Cocheco River is a Designated River. It was also pointed out that the work would require an NHB update. Beyond that, more details would be needed before specific impacts or mitigations could be discussed.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.